UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/750,817	12/28/2000	Gyorgy Szondy	4925-73	9297

7590   05/27/2005

Michael C. Stuart, Esq.
Cohen, Pontani, Lieberman & Pavane
Suite 1210
551 Fifth Avenue
New York, NY   10176

EXAMINER
NGUYEN, QUANG N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2141	

DATE MAILED: 05/27/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action	09/750,817	SZONDY, GYORGY
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Quang N Nguyen	2141	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 13 May 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may <u>only</u> be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

<u>PERIOD FOR REPLY</u> [check either a) or b)]

a) ☒ The period for reply expires <u>6</u> months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.

2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:

    (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);

    (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);

    (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or

    (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.
    NOTE: _____.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

5. ☒ The a)☐ affidavit, b)☐ exhibit, or c)☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: *See attachment*.

6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.

7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a)☐ will not be entered or b)☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

    The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

    Claim(s) allowed: *None*.

    Claim(s) objected to: *None*.

    Claim(s) rejected: *1-12*.

    Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: *None*.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on _____ is a)☐ approved or b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.

10. ☐ Other: _____.

Detailed Action

1.   This Office Action is in response to the Amendment filed on 05/13/2005. Claims

2-3 have been amended.   Claims 1-12 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3.   Claims 6-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being

indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject

matter which applicant regards as the invention.

4.   Claim 6 recites the limitation "... the other network node." in line 6. There is

insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

5.   Claim 7 recites the limitation "... the other network node." in line 2. There is

insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act

of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical

Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting

directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000.

Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior

to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

7.   **Claims 1-3, 5-7 and 9-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being**

anticipated by Colson et al. (US 6,708,217), herein after referred as Colson.

8.   As to claim 1, Colson teaches a multi-modal document content can be received,

demultiplexed and distributed to one or more appropriate content receivers, comprising:

a data store for storing user-supplied designation of the another network node *(a*

content registry 300 of Fig. 3 dynamically generated as clients register themselves

containing content renderers such as facsimile 201, handheld device 204, dashboard device 202, and audio processor 203) (Colson, C9: L6-10);

a sensible indicator for indicating whether the user has requested redirection of data content *(for content type "text/ascii" indicating the user has requested redirection of data content to the fax machine 201; for "text/html", redirecting to the handheld computing device 204, etc.)* (Colson, C7: L57-62 and C8: L2-14); and

a data path operatively connected to the data store and to the sensible indicator and adaptable to route data content to the mobile terminal OR to the another network node designated in the data store according to the sensible indicator *(data paths 270c-f operatively connected to the demultiplexer component 220 to route data content to the handheld device 204 OR to another network node such as fax machine 201, dashboard device 202, and audio processor 203)* (Colson, C7:L33 – C8:L14).

9.   As to claims 2-3, Colson teaches the apparatus of claim 1, wherein:

the content from the server is in HTML format *(Wdemux 220 receives HTTP responses in HTML format from Web servers 240, 250)* (Colson, C1: L35-47); and

the data path is further adaptable to convert content to WAP format and to selectably route WAP-format content to the mobile terminal *(using WAP PUSH)* or to send the content in HTML format to the another network node *(Wdemux 220 may use the HTTP POST method to deliver content to a rendering client)* (Colson, C10: L18-28).

10.   Claims 5-7 are corresponding method claims of apparatus claims 1-3; therefore,

they are rejected under the same rationale.

11.   Claims 9-12 is a corresponding method claim of apparatus claims 1-3; therefore,

they are rejected under the same rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

12.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

13.   Claims 4 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Colson, in view of Aas et al. (US 5,940,740), herein after referred as Aas.

14.   As to claim 4, Colson teaches the apparatus of claim 1, but does not explicitly

teach a logic circuit to reset the sensible indicator after the content is redirected.

In a related art, Aas teaches a method and system for message transmission

verification, wherein the message center transmits the message to the intended

recipient, if a network acknowledgement has been received, then the recipient is presumed to have received the message and the message center resets the message status indicator to indicate that the message has been sent and received (Aas, C4:L61 – C5:L2).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Colson and Aas to include a logic circuit to reset the sensible indicator after the content is redirected since such methods were conventionally employed in the art to allow the system tracking the status of the message in order to notify the user whether the message has already been sent and received; and to ask if they wish to have the message resent.

15.   Claim 8 is a corresponding method claim of apparatus claim 4; therefore, it is rejected under the same rationale.

Response to Arguments

16.   In the remarks, the Applicant argued in substance that

(A)   Prior Art fails to teach "a data store for storing a user-supplied designation of the another network node", as recited in claim 1.

As to point **(A)**, **Colson** teaches a multi-modal document content can be received, demultiplexed and distributed to one or more appropriate content receivers, wherein *a content registry 300 of Fig. 3* *(i.e., a data store)* is dynamically generated as *clients register themselves containing the content renderers* *(user-registered content renderers, i.e., user-supplied designation of the another network node)* such as facsimile 201, handheld device 204, dashboard device 202, and audio processor 203, etc., capable of rendering that content type (**Colson**, Fig. 3 and C9: L6-10).

(B)   Prior Art fails to teach "a sensible indicator for indicating whether the user has requested the direction of data content", as recited in claim 1.

As to point **(B)**, **Colson** teaches for content type "text/ascii" *(i.e., indicator "text/ascii")*, the Wdemux consults the registered content registry 300 which indicates that the user has requested redirection of data content to the fax machine 201; for "text/html", redirecting to the handheld computing device 204, etc.) (**Colson**, C7: L57-62 and C8: L2-14).

(C)   Prior Art fails to teach "the data path is adaptable to route data content to the mobile terminal **OR** to the another network node designated in the data store according to the sensible indicator", as recited in claim 1.

As to point (C), **Colson** teaches data paths 270c-f *(as illustrated in Fig. 2)* operatively connected to the demultiplexer component 220 to route data content according to the sensible indicator *(such as "text/html")* to the registered handheld device 204 *(via data path 270f)* OR to the another registered network node such as registered fax machine 201 *(for "text/ascii" via data path 270c)*, registered dashboard device 202 *(for "image/gif" via data path 270d)*, and registered audio processor 203 *(for "audio/wav" via data path 270e)* (**Colson**, C7:L33 – C8:L14).

17.   Applicant's arguments as well as request for reconsideration filed on 05/13/2005 have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive.

18.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Quang N. Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-3886.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's SPE, Rupal Dharia, can be reached at (571) 272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization is (703) 872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

RUPAL DHARIA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER